United Nations A/C.3/52/SR.43

General Assembly
Fifty-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
5 December 1997

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 43rd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 20 November 1997, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Busacca ..... (Italy)

Contents

Agenda item 103: Crime prevention and criminal justice (continued)

Agenda item 106: Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women (continued)

Agenda item 109: Programme of activities of the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People (continued)

Agenda item 111: Right of peoples to self-determination (continued)

Agenda item 112: Human rights questions (continued)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (continued)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (continued)

(d) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (continued)

(e) Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

97-82922 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda item 103: Crime prevention and criminal justice (continued) (A/C.3/52/L.5)

Draft resolution A/C.3/52/L.5 on preparations for the Tenth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders

Statement of programme budget implications (A/C.3/52/L.43)

1. Mr. Sach (Director of the Programme Planning and Budget Division) drew attention to a statement (A/C.3/52/L.43) of the programme budget implications of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.3/52/L.5, submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

2. The draft resolution had been adopted by the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at its sixth session held in Vienna in April-May 1997, with the recommendation that the General Assembly should adopt it at its fifty-second session. At that time, and during its subsequent consideration by the Economic and Social Council, no statement of programme budget implications had been produced owing to an oversight, for which the Secretariat bore responsibility.

3. Paragraph 15 of the draft resolution read: "Further requests the Secretary-General to make available the necessary resources for the participation of the least developed countries in the regional preparatory meetings for the Tenth Congress and the Congress itself, in accordance with past practice". The last five words had been interpreted in Vienna as a reiteration of an established practice followed for previous Congresses. Apparently, General Assembly policy on the payment of travel costs had not been verified with the Programme Planning and Budget Division. Since records in Vienna showed that payments had been made in the past, it had been assumed that "past practice" did not mean that the General Assembly would have to decide on that practice for the Tenth Congress.

4. The statement of programme budget implications contained in document A/C.3/52/L.43 stated that the cost of travel in connection with the regional preparatory meetings would be $83,700. No reference was made to the need or otherwise for appropriations, since that matter was strictly within the province of the Fifth Committee. If the draft resolution (A/C.3/52/L.5) was adopted, the Fifth Committee would be required, after review, to report to the plenary on the programme budget implications and to say whether it deemed it necessary to appropriate any additional funds in respect of anticipated travel costs for the preparatory meetings.

5. Mr. Winnick (United States of America) said that, at the meeting of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at which the draft resolution had been proposed, his delegation had specifically and explicitly requested information as to its programme budget implications, and had been assured that there were none. Although one oversight might be understandable, it had been compounded by the failure to submit a statement of programme budget implications subsequently to the Economic and Social Council. The budgetary implications of a resolution were integral to the resolution; it was therefore difficult to consider that the measure before the Committee was in fact identical to that which had been approved by the Commission and the Council.

6. Given the importance of providing travel expenses to enable the representatives of the least developed countries to attend events like the Tenth Congress, and the regularity of the practice, it was difficult to see how the expenditure could be considered as a new or unexpected item.

7. In the circumstances, his delegation requested that consideration of the draft resolution should be deferred until the following week.

8. It was so decided.

Agenda item 106: Implementation of the outcome of the Fourth World Conference on Women (continued) (A/C.3/52/L.42)

Draft resolution A/C.3/52/L.42 on follow-up to the Fourth World Conference on Women and full implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action

9. The Chairman said that draft resolution A/C.3/52/L.42 had no programme budget implications.

10. Draft resolution A/C.3/52/L.42 was adopted.

Agenda item 109: Programme of activities of the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People (continued) (A/C.3/52/L.40/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/52/L.40/Rev.1, entitled "International Decade of the World's Indigenous People"

11. The Chairman said that draft resolution A/C.3/52/L.40/Rev.1 had no programme budget implications. Costa Rica and Guatemala had joined the sponsors.

12. Draft resolution A/C.3/52/L.40/Rev.1 was adopted.

Agenda item 111: Right of peoples to self-determination (continued) (A/C.3/52/L.41)

Draft resolution A/C.3/52/L.41, entitled "The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination".

13. The Chairman said that draft resolution A/C.3/52/L.41 had no programme budget implications. Angola, Guinea and Guinea-Bissau had joined the sponsors.

14. Mr. Winnick (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would oppose the draft resolution because, like so many before it, it sought to involve the United Nations in the Middle East peace process by dealing with a final status issue which was to be the object of direct negotiation among the parties. Also, it singled out one group of people for self-determination, although the Committee had previously adopted a draft resolution on the general subject of self-determination. There were numerous groups of people throughout the world, some of which regarded themselves as being under foreign occupation, yet they were not singled out in the same way.

15. Adoption of such a politicized draft resolution would not help to reinvigorate the peace process; his delegation believed it might have the opposite effect.

16. Ms. Hadar (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that her delegation would vote against the draft resolution, because it prejudged the outcome of the final status talks to be held between Israel and the Palestinians. That was a matter to be dealt with in the context of bilateral negotiations, not in international forums.

17. The fourth preambular paragraph expressed concern over the state of the peace process and the supposed non-implementation of the agreements between the parties. The Committee was not the right place for analysing the ups and downs of the negotiations. Also, it should be noted that Israel had implemented all of the commitments contained in its agreements with the Palestine Liberation Organization.

18. Her delegation was heartened that Israel and the Palestinians had begun meeting again on substantive issues, and looked forward to progress in those talks.

19. The Chairman asked the Committee to vote on draft resolution A/C.3/52/L.41.

20. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

El Salvador, Fiji, Georgia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Norway, Uruguay.

21. Draft resolution A/C.3/52/L.41 was adopted by 141 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.

22. Mr. Al-Hariri (Syria) welcomed the adoption of the draft text, which showed that the international community was concerned to end the suffering of the Palestinian people. His delegation had voted in favour in order to show its support for the just struggle of the Palestinian people and its hope that negotiations would lead to a lasting, comprehensive settlement, with land in exchange for peace, on the basis of the Madrid talks and the relevant Security Council resolutions. As the entire world was well aware, it was the Israeli side that was to blame for the deterioration of the

Middle East peace process referred to in the fourth preambular paragraph, owing to its refusal to honour its obligations. His delegation had reservations about the fifth preambular paragraph: it did not adequately reflect Security Council resolution 424 (1967), which called for Israel's withdrawal from all occupied territories, in accordance with the principle that territory could not legitimately be acquired by force.

23. Mr. Najem (Lebanon) said that the Committee's adoption of the draft resolution was an indication that the international community wished to end the suffering of the Palestinian people, whose legitimate human rights and aspirations had been denied by Israel. Lebanon had voted in favour to show its support for the Palestinian people's struggle to determine their own future, an end to the occupation of their land, and a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East on the basis of the Madrid conference, Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 425 (1978), and the principle of land for peace. Israel was to blame for the deterioration of the Middle East peace process mentioned in the fourth preambular paragraph, as it had accepted obligations which it was refusing to fulfil. His delegation had reservations about the fifth preambular paragraph, which was a one-sided reflection of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) in that it did not state explicitly that Israel must withdraw from all occupied Arab territories in accordance with the principle that territory could not legitimately be acquired by force.

24. Mr. Willie (Norway) said that Norway supported the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. It had abstained from voting on the draft resolution, considering that the final status of the territories was a subject for negotiations between Israel and the Palestinian Liberation Organization. His Government was continuing to encourage the parties to accelerate the ongoing negotiations. In the meantime, the Committee should be careful to avoid adding to or detracting from what only the parties could decide.

25. Mr. Amyari (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, but reserved its position regarding the fourth preambular paragraph; the formulation was not conducive to the full restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

26. Ms. Barghouti (Observer for Palestine) thanked the States that had voted for the draft resolution; the Egyptian delegation, in particular, had made praiseworthy efforts to promote that outcome. It had been rewarding to find so many States, including some that had not supported similar draft resolutions supporting the text, thus underscoring their support of the peace process and of the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination. That right was based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and other international conventions. Recognition of that right did not imply any prejudgement as to the outcome of the peace process, and acceptance of the process of negotiation did not imply any renunciation of the Palestinian people's inalienable rights. It was devoutly to be hoped that the draft resolution would be unanimously adopted in the General Assembly and that the Palestinian people would soon realize their aspirations to freedom and independence, after so much suffering.

27. The Chairman noted that the Committee had concluded its consideration of item 111.

Agenda item 112: Human rights questions (continued) (A/52/3, 116, 173, A/52/254-S/1997/567, A/52/262, A/52/286-S/1997/647, A/52/301-S/1997/668, A/52/347, 432, 437 and A/52/447-S/1997/775)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (continued) (A/52/66, A/52/81-S/1997/153, A/52/85-S/1997/180, A/52/117, A/52/125-S/1997/334, A/52/133-S/1997/348, A/52/134-S/1997/349, A/52/135, 151, 182, 204, 205, 468, 469 and Add.1, 473-475, 477, 483, 489, 494, 498, 548 and 567)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (continued) (A/52/61-S/1997/68, A/52/64, A/52/125-S/1997/334, A/52/170, 472, 476, 479, 484, A/52/486/Add.1/Corr.1, A/52/490, 493, 496, 497, 499, 502, 505, 506, 510, 515, 522, 527 and 583)

(d) Comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action (continued) (A/52/36 and 182)

(e) Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (continued) (A/52/36 and 182)

28. Mr. Khalid (Sudan) said that concern for human rights could not be selective, and must not be used as a cover-up for the settling of political scores. Selectivity was an urgent issue requiring an immediate review of the tools and working methods used in the area of human rights, if only to ensure that the international community made judicious use of the limited resources available to it. The current tendency to adopt resolutions that targeted particular States was

politically motivated and not in accordance with the spirit of the Charter. Most unfortunately, it had become fashionable in some quarters to attempt to associate charges of terrorism and human rights violations with specific religions, including the Islamic religion.

29. International action on behalf of human rights was essential, certainly, but action at the national level, through constitutional provisions and legislation, was no less important. His Government (a democratically elected one, as the international and regional organizations that had supervised the electoral process had duly reported) had enacted just such domestic legislation, and had met, and would continue to meet, its corresponding international obligations. Special Rapporteurs and representatives of the Secretary-General were welcome to verify the human rights situation in the Sudan whenever they wished.

30. The Sudan supported the Secretary-General's proposed reforms of the Organization, including those relating to human rights. It was important, however, not to focus on some kinds of rights while neglecting others. There had been a regrettable trend of late to favour political and civil rights at the expense of economic rights and the right to development. The Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action had emphasized the indivisible nature of all human rights, and the resolutions adopted at the Vienna Conference had made it clear that food and coercive economic measures could not be used as political weapons by some States against others. In that connection, he wished to point out that economic sanctions did serious harm to the human rights of civilian populations, notably their right to life, development and dignity.

31. Ms. Mohamed (Yemen) said that as the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approached, the United Nations could take legitimate pride in its accomplishments in the field of human rights. However, it was distressing to find, at such a late date, that millions of human beings still suffered from poverty, disease, war and colonization, lacking the most basic necessities of freedom and dignity.

32. North and South tended to take opposite positions on the question of whether human rights, in the political sense, or the right to development should take precedence. It would be just as reasonable to ask whether the cart or the horse should be put first. Eloquent resolutions about protecting human rights were largely irrelevant in developing countries, afflicted as they were by poverty, illiteracy and low standards of health, and the international community must focus on solving those problems. Her country was well aware that human rights were indissolubly bound up with such issues as development, health, education and democracy, and was therefore working on both fronts at once, striving for economic development and universal education in order to create a political climate in which an understanding of human rights could flourish.

33. The democratic experiment currently under way was showing great promise. Political pluralism was in place, with more than 20 active parties, and free and fair parliamentary elections had been held, in which, moreover, two women deputies had won seats. Freedom of expression was guaranteed, and independent newspapers and other publications were thriving.

34. Yemen was a party to international covenants and other instruments on human rights, and believed in the complementary nature of human rights in the political sense and economic rights. However, it was opposed to the selective use of human rights issues to serve political ends. Double standards were unacceptable and must inevitably lead to confrontation and bickering instead of cooperation in the great common work of overcoming the remaining difficulties. With respect to the United Nations more particularly, it was essential to ensure that the socio-economic dimension was incorporated into all its human rights programmes.

35. Mr. Effendi (Indonesia) found it encouraging that the new United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights had endorsed the forging of a global partnership in meeting human rights challenges. There would be dialogue only where there was cooperation instead of confrontation.

36. In assessing the human rights situations in various countries, the level of development and limited national resources must be taken into account. It was disingenuous to lecture countries where, unfortunately, human rights were violated, when their Governments were exhausting all their resources servicing the debt and meeting the basic survival needs of their people as well as guaranteeing public order and preserving national stability. To evaluate progress in human rights on the basis of one or two specific rights disregarded the obstacles in the way of ensuring all human rights in the face of the poverty, ignorance and backwardness that afflicted much of mankind. Indonesia was encouraged that the High Commissioner intended to give the same emphasis to economic, social and cultural rights as to civil and political rights.

37. No country in the world had a monopoly on the moral high ground and nowhere were human rights fully respected. Some of the most vocal critics of the shortcomings of other nations were silent on the human rights problems in their own countries, or expressed such criticism in order to placate their

own domestic constituents or to pursue extraneous political agendas, often misrepresenting facts in the process.

38. Aware that Governments bore primary responsibility for promoting and protecting human rights, Indonesia had established a National Commission for Human Rights to investigate violations. It was working to implement the human rights conventions it had ratified and provided human rights education by offering better training in the administration of justice and in the security services. Any alleged human rights violations in Indonesia which had proved to be founded had been swiftly rectified and prosecuted. Of course there remained work to be done to improve the human rights situation in his country, but it would be hypocritical not to acknowledge the progress it had made since independence after more than three centuries of colonial subjugation whose effects were still being felt.

39. Mr. Alaee (Islamic Republic of Iran) observed that over time human rights had become the aspiration of all peoples. That was all the more reason that they must be defined and promoted with genuine respect for the plurality of beliefs, traditions, value systems and perspectives in the world.

40. On the basis of progressive Islamic principles, his Government affirmed the inherent dignity of all human beings and their equal and inalienable rights, which could neither be conferred nor arbitrarily denied by any political authority. The Islamic Republic had followed that political philosophy in all circumstances: in times of defiance by the terrorist groups that continued to be the main source of reports on the human rights situation in the country and in times of full-scale war as in times of national reconstruction.

41. Its long democratic tradition of elections had been demonstrated by the recent presidential elections, in which almost 90 per cent of those eligible to vote had participated. Freedom of expression in the country was steadily expanding, with a dynamic press, media and film industry flourishing, and individual creativity encouraged. A climate had been created where women could enjoy their human rights and have access to equal opportunities in the political and economic fields and in social development.

42. For some years, the Islamic Republic had been the object of politically motivated resolutions on human rights. His Government had always extended full cooperation to the Special Rapporteurs and representatives of the Commission on Human Rights in an effort to explore mutually acceptable ways of addressing the issue. Despite its offer to work with the sponsors of resolutions, they had persisted in their unjust, biased and selective treatment of the human rights situation in his country. By refusing to abandon such a confrontational attitude, often not supported by public opinion in their own countries, such delegations had done nothing to advance the international debate on human rights and little if anything to foster change for the better.

43. Mr. Kodellas (Greece), endorsed the statement made at an earlier meeting by the representative of Luxembourg on behalf of the European Union and directed his remarks to the situation of human rights in Cyprus, a matter of particular interest to Greece. The delegation of Cyprus had given an accurate and alarming picture of the situation prevailing in the Turkish occupied area of northern Cyprus, where the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Greek Cypriot population were being systematically violated, as they had been throughout the 23-year presence of the Turkish armed forces on the island. Turkey was pursuing the long-term goal of dividing Cyprus permanently, and was carrying out an ethnic cleansing in the part it occupied by killing and forcibly displacing people, separating families and illegally bringing in thousands of mainland Turks as settlers. The Turkish policy in Cyprus had remained unchanged regardless of the Government in power, and any assurances of a fresh approach should be discounted.

44. Turkey had flouted repeated Security Council resolutions calling for withdrawal of Turkish troops and settlers from Cyprus, but for reasons unrelated to human rights issues, Turkey had thus far enjoyed impunity. Turkey must be made to comply with international law and with the obligations it had assumed under international treaties, including treaties on humanitarian law, all of which had been incorporated into its domestic legislation.

45. Ms. Robinson (United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights) observed that she had been following the discussions with interest and had been impressed by the range of issues addressed and the clear commitment to human rights shown by the members of the Committee. She appreciated broad support for her understanding of her own mandate and that of her Office.

46. She drew attention to the timing of the Committee's human rights resolutions, on the threshold of 1998, a year which would focus the attention of the peoples of the world on human rights because of the special commemorations of the fiftieth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration. The Third Committee was the particular custodian of the valuable machinery established to protect human rights and as such must always have in mind the need for a rounded, holistic approach valuing the whole spectrum of rights. She welcomed the opportunity to underscore the importance of the Committee's work and to encourage it.

47. The Chairman said the floor was open for the exercise of rights of reply.

48. Mr. Baali (Algeria), speaking in exercise of that right, said that his country was determined to continue its work of national renewal, of which the promotion and protection of human rights was an essential component. That policy was in conformity with the freely expressed choice of the Algerian people. He wished to remind the Committee that Algeria was facing an extremely violent terrorist campaign that targeted women, children and the elderly. With the support of Algerian people, who had rejected terrorism and fundamentalism, the Algerian security forces were courageously fighting the terrorists. He resented the references to the so-called passivity of the security forces during certain massacres that had been committed; they constituted an extremely grave accusation based on unfounded allegations made by a certain non-governmental organization which was already well known for its lack of objectivity, professionalism and knowledge of the real situation in the countries that it criticized. The Algerian security forces had never failed in their mission and would continue to carry out their task resolutely and in the interest of peace and stability in the region. Working under extremely difficult conditions, they strictly respected Algerian laws and human rights.

49. With regard to the invitation to a dialogue, he pointed out that his country's National Assembly was a pluralistic democratically-elected body where a dozen political parties representing the entire political spectrum, including Islamist groups, were represented. Referring to freedom of the press, he noted that more than 200 foreign journalists, most of whom were Europeans, had covered the recent local elections in Algeria, and that 30 foreign journalists were currently covering the situation in Algeria. Lastly, he pointed out that, far from creating obstacles impeding the work of non-governmental human rights organizations, his Government had received a number of missions representing such organizations.

50. Mr. Taub (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the observer for Palestine had ignored the fact that in recent years direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians had brought about dramatic changes. At the current time, 95 per cent of the Palestinians in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip lived under Palestinian rule. If, as the observer for Palestine claimed, the violations of the human rights of the Palestinian people were among the worst in history, one could only wonder who bore the responsibility for those violations.

51. During its negotiations with the Palestine Liberation Organization, Israel had put forward detailed proposals for the protection of human rights. Unfortunately, the Palestinian side had objected to the inclusion of specific safeguards. Then, as now, the Palestinian leadership was interested only in its political agenda, not in the protection of human rights. If the observer for Palestine genuinely wished to address the real issues affecting the lives of Palestinians in the territories, there were forums for doing so. Accordingly, Israel called upon the Palestinian side to return to the parties' negotiating table to address all issues, including the final status issues. There was no doubt that the human rights of the Palestinians in the territories was a serious question. Nevertheless, until the Palestinian leadership fought terrorism and took part in negotiations on the final status issues, it was hard to believe they were taking the question of human rights seriously.

52. Mr. Al-Humaimidi (Iraq), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the statement made by the representative of Canada regarding alleged human rights violations in Iraq was nothing more than a tedious summary of allegations put forward by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Iraq, which had already been refuted. The representative of Canada should have verified his information instead of repeating hostile slogans which were part of the political campaign being carried out against Iraq. If Canada was really concerned about the human rights situation in that country, it should desist from making false allegations against Iraq's national system and interfering in its internal affairs.

53. Ms. Wahbi (Sudan), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that, in expressing his Government's concern about alleged human rights violations in the Sudan, the representative of Canada had not differentiated between the efforts of the Sudanese Government to promote and protect human rights and the violations committed by the only remaining rebel faction, which was continuing the war in southern Sudan. Instead of expressing concern about unsubstantiated reports, the Canadian Government should cooperate with the Sudanese authorities by providing assistance and technical advice so that Sudan could continue its efforts to promote human rights. Her Government had signed a peace treaty with all the warring factions, except one, and had initiated negotiations with that faction at the beginning of November. The Sudan intended to continue its efforts to reach a final peace settlement and halt the conflict, which had ravaged the country since 1955. She hoped that the Canadian Government would play a positive role in facilitating those efforts.

54. Mr. Arda (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right to reply, said that the accusations made by the representative of Greece would receive the reply that they deserved from the representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

In order to set the record straight, he pointed out that the division of Cyprus had taken place 34 years ago, in 1963, when the Greek Cypriot leadership, openly encouraged and supported by Greece, had initiated an "ethnic cleansing" campaign to annihilate the Turkish Cypriot population. In 1964, the United Nations had sent peacekeeping forces to Cyprus to end the hostilities. Subsequently, in an attempt to annex Cyprus, the Greek Government had engineered a coup in Nicosia in the summer of 1974, which had resulted in the regrouping of the two peoples in the northern and southern parts of the Island. In July 1974, the Greek Cypriot leader, Archbishop Makarios had accused Greece in the Security Council of invading Cyprus and violating its independence and sovereignty.

55. Turkey's subsequent intervention had been fully consistent with its legitimate rights and obligations. If the Turkish forces had not been deployed on the island, the fate of the Turkish Cypriots would have been no different from that of the Bosnians. Through its legitimate action in 1974 and its current presence on the island, Turkey was, first and foremost, protecting the most fundamental human right, the right to life of the Turkish Cypriots.

56. Greece seemed to have mastered the art of formulating policies based on illusions and distortions. It was hoped that the day would come when it would not feel it necessary to resort to misrepresentation of the facts.

57. Mr. Korneliou (Cyprus), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the international community could not accept the fait accompli created by Turkey on Cyprus through the use of military force and in blatant disregard of international law and numerous United Nations resolutions. The European Commission on Human Rights had established Turkey's responsibility for the human rights violations in the occupied part of the island. If Turkey had not invaded and occupied Cyprus, the human rights violations would not be continuing.

58. It was time to hold fully accountable those who refused to respect human rights and chose to disregard the international commitments that they had freely accepted. The Cypriot Government was determined to bring about a just and viable solution to the Cyprus problem, which would safeguard the human rights of its population, both Greek and Turkish Cypriots. To that end, it had submitted proposals to the Turkish Cypriot side to establish a bicommunal federal republic. The Turkish side, however, had not yet given any sign of changing its intransigent policy.

59. Mr. Kodellas (Greece) speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Committee was once again being subjected to unsubstantiated allegations by the representative of Turkey. Turkey spoke about how it intended in theory to promote human rights and adhere to international human rights conventions. However, that intention was not reflected in practice. In actual fact, there was not a single major human rights organization that had not repeatedly criticized Turkey's human rights record. In its total disregard for international law and the decisions of the world community, Turkey was the only Member State which recognized the illegal regime that it had established by force on Cyprus 23 years ago.

60. Mr. Arda (Turkey), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the Greeks and Greek Cypriots bore total responsibility for the unfortunate situation in Cyprus. The allegations put forward by the representative of Greece had been repeatedly exposed as false and hypocritical. The representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus would reply to them in writing.

61. Mr. Korneliou (Cyprus) said that the reference by the delegation of Turkey to a so-called Turkish Cypriot representative was an affront to the legitimacy of the Third Committee. There was no such Turkish Cypriot representative to the United Nations. There was only one Republic of Cyprus and he was its legitimate representative in that Committee.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.